

Application No. 10/597,030

June 10, 2009

Reply to the Office Action dated March 11, 2009

Page 6 of 10

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 16-19, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS the drawings, and CANCELS claims 32 and 33.

Claims 18, 19, 24, and 27 were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 18, 19, 24, and 27 are dependent upon generic claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected claims 18, 19, 24, and 27 when generic claim 16 is allowed.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for allegedly failing to show every feature of the claims. Fig. 5 has been amended to show the feature of "at least part of the one of the curved portion and the folded portion of the light source lamp is covered with a lamp frame" which was described, for example, in Figs. 1-b and 6-a of the drawings, and paragraph [0024] of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that replacement Fig. 5 corrects originally filed Fig. 5 and shows elements and arrangements thereof that were described in Applicant's originally filed application. The Examiner is reminded that an amendment to correct an obvious error does not constitute new matter where one skilled in the art would not only recognize the existence of the error in the specification or drawings, but also recognize the appropriate correction. See *In re Oda*, 443 F.2d 1200, 170 USPQ 268 (CCPA 1971). Thus, no new matter is introduced by amended Fig. 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to the specification for allegedly containing minor informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to correct the minor informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claims 16, 17, 23, 29, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. More specifically, the Examiner alleged that the feature of "at least part of the one of the curved portion and the folded portion of the light source lamp is

covered with a lamp frame" was not enabled.

Paragraph [0024] of Applicant's specification states:

[0024] Preferable configurations of the above-mentioned lighting device for display devices preferably include: **(1) a configuration in which at least part of the folded portion (curved portion) of the light source lamp is covered with a lamp frame;** (2) a configuration in which the lighting device has an optical member provided with a light-reducing or light-shielding treatment on a display side of at least part of the folded portion (curved portion) of the light source lamp; (3) a configuration in which the lighting device has at least part of the folded portion (curved portion) of the light source lamp outside an effective display region; (4) a configuration in which at least part of the folded portion (curved portion) of the light source lamp is provided with a light-reducing or light-shielding treatment; **(5) a configuration in which the lighting device has a reflective member provided with a light-reducing treatment on a side opposed to the display side of at least part of the folded portion (curved portion) of the light source lamp. In any of these configurations or combination of these configurations, functional effects of the present invention can be sufficiently exhibited.** (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that originally filed Fig. 5 contained an error, in that it only appears to show one end of the light source lamp 11 being covered by a frame. As is shown in originally filed Fig. 9, which depicts the well known relationship between a frame 84 and a light source lamp 83, and shows that both ends of a light source lamp are covered with a lamp frame because the light source lamp is horizontally supported by the frame. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been able to construct a display device in which at least part of the folded portion of the light source lamp is covered with a lamp frame such as was described in Applicant's specification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16, 17, 23, 29, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant has canceled claims 32 and 33, thus rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 32 and 33 moot.

In view of the foregoing amendments, remarks, and the fact that there are no outstanding prior art rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable. Claims 17, 23, 26, and 29-31 depend upon claim 16, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 16 is allowable.

In addition, since generic claim 16 is allowable, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected claims 18, 19, 24, and 27.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 10, 2009

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**

1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200

Reston, VA 20191

Telephone: (571) 313-7440

Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

/Joseph R. Keating #37,368/  
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating

Registration No. 37,368